Appl. No. 10/735,549
Amdt. dated May 26, 2006
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have received the final Office action dated April 5, 2006, in which the Examiner: 1) objected to claims 1 and 14 because of informalities; 2) rejected claims 1-13 and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lie (U.S. Pat. No. 6,671,868, hereinafter "Lie") in view of Dahl (U.S. Pat. No. 6,734,046, hereinafter "Dahl"); and 3) objected to claims 14-17 and 19-20, but indicated they would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the claim objection.

With this Response, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 14 and canceled previously withdrawn claims 21-25. Applicants may choose to pursue the claims 21-25 in a continuation application. Based on the amendments and arguments contained herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

I.   OBJECTION TO DECLARATION

The Examiner objected to the inventors' declaration because the Examiner's copy of the declaration shows that the inventor name Herbert R. Kolk is missing the letter "e" in the first name. In response, Applicants submit a clean copy of the original declaration, which shows the inventor name Herbert R. Kolk is not missing the letter "e" in the first name.

II.   CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Examiner objected to claims 1 and 14 for various informalities. In response, Applicants amended claims 1 and 14 to comply with the Examiner's requests. The Examiner indicated claim 14 would be allowable if amended to overcome the Examiner's objection. For at least this reason, claim 14 and its dependent claims are allowable.

III.   CLAIM REJECTIONS

Amended claim 1, in part, requires "[a] bump map application [that] displays a plurality of editable textual character groups representative of a plurality of bumps, the textual character groups are arranged on the GUI according to a relative coordinate position of the bumps with respect to an origin." Claim 1 further requires "a track definition application executed by the CPU, the

174821.01/2182.18300   Page 7 of 11   HP PDNO 200310231-1

track definition application displaying on the GUI, individual track definitions and a macro that defines a plurality of tracks of an integrated circuit metal layer." Claim 1 further requires "[a] data extraction application automatically extracts data from the bump map application and the track definition application for use by a router application."

None of the references cited by the Examiner, considered individually or together, teach or suggest "a track definition application executed by the CPU, the track definition application displaying on the GUI, individual track definitions and a macro that defines a plurality of tracks of an integrated circuit metal layer." For at least this reason, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Claim 26, in part, requires "means for editing bump labels by displaying straight-line connections between bumps and input/output circuitry prior to displaying tracks between the bumps and input/output circuitry." None of the references cited by the Examiner, considered individually or together, teach or suggest this limitation. The Examiner does not even appear to address this limitation in the Office action. For at least these reasons, claim 26 and its dependent claims are allowable.

IV.   CONCLUSION

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are

Appl. No. 10/735,549
Amdt. dated May 26, 2006
Reply to final Office action of April 5, 2006

hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan D. Christenson
PTO Reg. No. 54,036
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
AGENT FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

174621.01/2162.18300   Page 9 of 11   HP PDNO 200310231-1

PAGE 11/13 * RCVD AT 5/26/2006 3:16:37 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/8 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:7132388008 * DURATION (mm-ss):06-20